

II. REMARKS

In the last response, GPS was added to the independent claims. The Examiner argues that Chatterjee teaches the use of GPS for location determination. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Chatterjee does mention GPS vehicle location devices. However, Chatterjee does not teach to use GPS for determining the location of the mobile station. In col. 4, lines 20-30, Chatterjee teaches that to locate a mobile station, the mobile station sends a MIN (mobile identification number) to a base station. GPS is not utilized in locating the mobile station.

The combination of Chatterjee and Tiedemann differs from the present invention at least in two points:

First, the present invention teaches to locate the mobile station using a satellite positioning system. As explained above, Chatterjee does not use GPS in determining the location of the mobile station.

Second, in the present invention the mobile station sends a message comprising the location of the mobile station to a management system. Chatterjee does not send such a message comprising the location of the mobile station. In Chatterjee, the message sent by the mobile station is the identification number of the mobile station. In the present invention, the message comprises the actual location of the mobile station. Furthermore, the location is determined by a satellite positioning system. Thus, the message comprises data which has been determined in the mobile station and which content is previously unknown to the system. In Chatterjee, the content of the message is always the same. It does not comprise any information about the location of

the mobile station, only the identification of the mobile station.

Claims 1 and 16 recite "...a message indicating...the location of the terminal determined using the global positioning system...". This is not shown in Chatterjee or Tieddmann even when they are combined.

It is also noted that there is no suggestion to combine the two references as required by Ex parte Jones, 62 USPQ2d 1206, 1208, and Ex parte Metcalf 67 USPQ2d 1633,1635.

Therefore the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-9, and 16-18 under 35 USC 103 on this combination of references should be withdrawn.

Also, Lee fails to disclose the claimed GPS feature. Thus the rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn since combining Lee with Tiedemann and Chatterjee does not result in the present invention.

Further, Sarpola also fails to disclose the GPS feature. Thus the rejection of claims 11-15 and 19-22 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn since combining Sarpola with Tiedemann and Chatterjee does not result in the present invention.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check in the amount of \$110.00 is enclosed for a 1 month extension of time fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler
Henry I. Steckler
Reg. No. 24,139

Nov. 18, 2004
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 11/18/04

Signature: Doris W. Reeman
Person Making Deposit